



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

Heck Family Trust  
Varda Treibach-Heck  
784 Vespucci Lane  
Foster City CA 94404

**MAILED**

**DEC 02 2010**

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

In re Patent of Treibach-Heck :

Patent No. 7,080,325 :

Issue Date: July 18, 2006 :

Application No. 10/080,472 :

Filed: February 22, 2002 :

Attorney Docket No. CALL-TELL PD :

ON PETITION

This is a decision on the petition under 37 CFR 1.378(b), filed August 17, 2010 (certificate of mailing date August 13, 2010), to accept the unavoidably delayed payment of a maintenance fee for the above-identified patent.

The petition is **DISMISSED**.

If reconsideration of this decision is desired, a petition for reconsideration under 37 CFR 1.378(e) must be filed within TWO (2) MONTHS from the mail date of this decision. No extension of this 2-month time limit can be granted under 37 CFR 1.136(a) or (b). Any such petition for reconsideration must be accompanied by the petition fee of \$400 as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(f). The petition for reconsideration should include an exhaustive attempt to provide the lacking item(s) noted below, since, after a decision on the petition for reconsideration, the Director will undertake no further reconsideration or review of the matter.

BACKGROUND

The patent issued July 18, 2006. The first maintenance fee due could have been paid during the period from July 18, 2009, through January 18, 2010 or with a surcharge during the period from January 19, 2010, through July 18, 2010. Accordingly, the patent expired July 19, 2010.

STATUTE AND REGULATION

37 CFR 1.378(a) provides that the Director may accept the payment of any maintenance fee due on a patent based on an expiration of the patent, if, upon petition, the delay in payment of the maintenance fee is shown to the satisfaction of the Director to have been unavoidable or unintentional. The appropriate surcharge set forth in § 1.20(i) must be paid as a condition of accepting payment of the maintenance fee. The surcharges set at 37 CFR 1.20(i) are established pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 41(c) and, therefore, are not

subject to small entity provisions of 35 U.S.C. 41(h). No separate petition fee is required for this petition. If the Director accepts payment of the maintenance fee upon petition, the patent shall be considered as not having expired but will be subject to the intervening rights and provisions of 35 U.S.C. 41(c)(2).

The patent statute at 35 U.S.C. 41(c)(1) provides as follows:

"The Commissioner may accept the payment of any maintenance fee required by subsection (b) of this section... at any time after the six-month grace period if the delay is shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner to have been unavoidable."

The statute's promulgating rule, 37 CFR 1.378(b), provides that any petition to accept the delayed payment of a maintenance fee must include the following:

- (1) the required maintenance fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.20(e) - (g);
- (2) the surcharge set forth in 37 CFR 1.20(i)(1); and
- (3) a showing that the delay was unavoidable since reasonable care was taken to ensure that the maintenance fee would be paid timely and that the petition was filed promptly after the patentee was notified of, or otherwise became aware of, the expiration of the patent. The required showing must enumerate the steps taken to ensure timely payment of the maintenance fee, the date and the manner in which patentee became aware of the expiration of the patent, and the steps taken to file the petition promptly.

Furthermore, an adequate showing requires a statement by all persons with direct knowledge of the cause of the delay, setting forth the facts as they know them. Copies of all documentary evidence referred to in a statement should be furnished as exhibits to the statement.

#### OPINION

Petitioner urges that the payment of the 3 1/2 year maintenance fee for the above-identified patent was unavoidably delayed because the owner of the patent, Call-Tell LLC was embroiled in involuntary bankruptcy proceedings when the 3 1/2 year maintenance fee was due and that the bankruptcy trustee did not transfer intellectual property rights in the patent to the current owner, the Heck Family Trust, until August 12, 2010. It is noted the present petition was filed one day later, on August 13, 2010.

The showing of record is inadequate to establish unavoidable delay within the meaning of 37 CFR 1.378(b)(3).

Petitions for the delayed payment of maintenance fees under 35 U.S.C. 41(c)(1) are treated under the same standard as petitions for revival of abandoned applications under 35 U.S.C. 133 because both statutory provisions use the same language, i.e., "unavoidable" delay. Ray v. Leyman, 55 F.3d 606, 608-609, 34 USPQ2d 1786, 1787 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (quoting In re Patent No. 4,409,763, 7 USPQ2d 1798, 1800 (Comm'r Pat. 1988), aff'd, Rydeen v. Quigg, 748 F. Supp. 900, 16 USPQ2d 1876 (D.D.C. 1990), aff'd, 937 F.2d 623 (Fed. Cir. 1991) (table), cert. denied, 502 U.S. 1075 (1992). Decisions on reviving

abandoned applications have adopted the reasonably prudent person standard in determining if the delay was unavoidable as follows:

The word 'unavoidable' ....is applicable to ordinary human affairs, and requires no more or greater care or diligence than is generally used and observed by prudent and careful men in relation to their most important business. It permits them in the exercise of this care to rely upon the ordinary and trustworthy agencies of mail and telegraph, worthy and reliable employees, and such other means and instrumentalities as are usually employed in such important business. If unexpectedly, or through unforeseen fault or imperfection of these agencies and instrumentalities, there occurs a failure, it may properly be said to be unavoidable, all other conditions of promptness in its rectification being present.

In re Mattullath, 38 App. D.C. 497, 514-515 (1912) (quoting Ex parte Pratt, 1887 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 31, 32-33 (Comm'r Pat. 1887); see also Winkler v. Ladd, 221 F. Supp. 550, 552, 138 USPQ 666, 167-168 (D.D.C. 1963), aff'd, 143 USPQ 172 (D.C. Cir. 1963); Ex parte Henrich, 1913 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 139, 141 (1913). In addition, decisions on revival are made on a "case by case basis, taking all the facts and circumstances into account." Smith v. Massinghoff, 671 F.2d 533, 538, 213 USPQ 977, 982 (D.C. Cir. 1982). The requirement in 35 U.S.C. 133 for a showing of unavoidable delay requires not only a showing that the delay which resulted in the abandonment of the application was unavoidable (or expiration of the patent as it applies to 35 U.S.C. 41(c)(1)), but also a showing of unavoidable delay from the time an applicant becomes aware of the abandonment of the application until the filing of a petition to revive (or a petition under 37 CFR 1.378(b) to reinstate the patent under 35 U.S.C. 41(c)(1)). See In re Application of Takao, 17 USPQ2d 1155 (Comm'r Pat. 1990). Finally, a petition cannot be granted where a petitioner has failed to meet his or her burden of establishing that the delay was "unavoidable." Haines v. Quigg, 673 F. Supp. 314, 316-317, 5 USPQ2d 1130, 1131-1132 (N.D. Ind. 1987).

In determining whether a delay in paying a maintenance fee was unavoidable, one looks to whether the party responsible for payment of the maintenance fee exercised the due care of a reasonably prudent person. Ray, 55 F.3d at 609-609, 34 USPQ2d at 1787. The party whose delay is relevant is the party in interest at the time action is needed to be taken. In Re Kim, 12 USPQ2d 1595 (Comm'r Pat. 1988).

The record fails to disclose that the party in interest or the bankruptcy trustee took reasonable steps to ensure timely payment of the maintenance fee. In fact, the record indicates that no steps were taken by party in interest or the bankruptcy trustee to ensure timely payment of the maintenance fee. Since no steps were taken, 37 CFR 1.378(b) precludes acceptance of the delayed payment of the maintenance fee.

Call-Tell LLC was the assignee of the patent at the time the maintenance fee was due. Call-Tell LLC was involved in involuntary bankruptcy proceedings at the time the maintenance fee was due. Call-Tell LLC (presumably) received the maintenance fee reminder for the patent on March 5, 2010 and forwarded it on the bankruptcy trustee and her attorney. Therefore, Call-Tell LLC and the bankruptcy trustee were aware that a maintenance fee was due by July 18, 2010.

On August 12, 2010, the Heck Family Trust purchased the patent.

There is no evidence in the record that anyone took steps to ensure timely payment of the maintenance fee.

To prevail under 37 CFR 1.378(b): Petitioner must demonstrate, via a documented showing, that there was a reliable tracking system in place to monitor the due date of the maintenance fee and that a responsible party had docketed this patent in that system. Evidence should be submitted which demonstrates that despite reasonable care by the patentee and/or the patentee's agent to implement reasonable steps to ensure the timely payment of the maintenance fee, the maintenance fee was nevertheless, unavoidably not paid. Was this patent entered into a reliable tracking system, or was Call-Tell LLC aware of the requirement to pay the maintenance fee only because a Maintenance Fee Reminder was sent from the Office?

The bankruptcy trustee has not provided a statement as to what steps she took with respect to tracking and payment the maintenance fee. Why wasn't the value of the asset protected by payment of the maintenance fee?

It is noted that petitioner, Varda Treibach-Heck is a joint inventor of the patent, she is a founder of Call-Tell LLC and has served as president of the company. By July 12, 2010, the trustee had agreed to sell Call-Tell's patents to the Heck Family Trust subject to objections and/or higher and better bids through August 3, 2010. Ms. Treibach-Heck was aware that a maintenance fee was due and she had a strong interest in the patent. However, she chose not to pay the maintenance fee prior to the expiration of the patent. Petitioner is reminded that the Office accepts timely paid maintenance fees from anyone.

It follows that petitioner did not exercise the due care and diligence of a reasonably prudent person, nor did petitioner exercise due diligence with respect to tracking and paying the maintenance fee for this patent. It appears the bankruptcy trustee did not take any steps to ensure timely payment of the maintenance fee. As such, petitioner has failed to reasonably establish unavoidable delay.

Given the facts and circumstances surrounding the expiration of the patent, petitioner is **strongly** encouraged to file a petition under the unintentional delay standard of 37 CFR 1.378(c). The \$700.00 surcharge submitted with the present petition will be applied toward the \$1,640.00 surcharge for reinstating a patent expired unintentionally leaving a balance due of \$940.

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be delivered through one of the following mediums:

**By mail:**


**Mail Stop PETITIONS  
Commissioner for Patents  
Post Office Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450**

By hand: Customer Service Window  
Mail Stop Petitions  
Randolph Building  
401 Dulany Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314

By fax: (571) 273-8300  
ATTN: Office of Petitions

By internet:               EFS-Web  
                              [www.uspto.gov/ebs/efs\\_help.html](http://www.uspto.gov/ebs/efs_help.html)  
                              (for help using EFS-Web call the  
                              Patent Electronic Business Center  
                              at (866) 217-9197)

Telephone inquiries should be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3230.

  
Shirene Willis Brantley  
Senior Petitions Attorney  
Office of Petitions